

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING INC. §  
and CELERITY IP, LLC §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00486-JRG-RSP  
AT&T CORP. ET AL. § (Lead Case)

---

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING INC. §  
and CELERITY IP, LLC §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00487-JRG-RSP  
T-MOBILE USA, INC. § (Member Case)

---

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING INC. §  
and CELERITY IP, LLC §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00488-JRG-RSP  
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A  
VERIZON WIRELESS § (Member Case)

---

INNOVATIVE SONIC LIMITED AND  
CELERITY IP, LLC §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00490-JRG  
T-MOBILE USA, INC. § (Lead Case)

---

INNOVATIVE SONIC LIMITED AND  
CELERITY IP, LLC §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00489-JRG  
AT&T CORP., et al § (Member Case)

---

INNOVATIVE SONIC LIMITED AND  
CELERITY IP, LLC §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00491-JRG  
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A  
VERIZON WIRELESS § (Member Case)

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendants' Unopposed Motion to Consolidate (the "Motion") filed by Defendants AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility II LLC, AT&T Services Inc., T-Mobile, USA, Inc., and CellCo Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Defendants"). (Dkt. No. 32 at 1.) The Court previously consolidated six actions against the Defendants into two according to plaintiffs, resulting in the following division:

<b>Asus Technology Licensing Cases</b>	<b>Innovative Sonic Cases</b>
Asus Technology Licensing Inc., <i>et al</i> v. AT&T Inc., <i>et al</i> , Case No. 2:23-cv-486-JRG-RSP (Lead Case)	Innovative Sonic Ltd., <i>et al</i> v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-00490-JRG (Lead Case)
Asus Technology Licensing Inc., <i>et al</i> v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-487-JRG-RSP	Innovative Sonic Ltd., <i>et al</i> v. Verizon Communications Inc., Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-00491-JRG
Asus Technology Licensing Inc., <i>et al</i> v. Verizon Communications Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-488-JRG-RSP	Innovative Sonic Ltd., <i>et al</i> v. AT&T Inc., <i>et al</i> , Inc. Case No. 2:23-cv-00489-JRG

(*Id.* at 2.)

After consolidation, the Defendants filed their respective Answer & Counterclaims naming ASUSTek Computer Inc. as a Counterclaim-Defendant and asserting counterclaims for (1) declaratory judgment of non-infringement and (2) breach of obligation to negotiate in good faith. (*Id.*, citing, e.g., Case No. 2:23-cv-490-JRG, Dkt. No. 27.) Defendants request that the Court consolidate all cases for pretrial purposes, with Case No. 2:23-cv-486-JRG-RSP designated as the Lead Case. (*Id.*) Plaintiffs do not oppose the relief requested. (*Id.* at 1, 5.)

Having considered the Motion, and noting its unopposed nature, the Court is of the opinion that it should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Case Nos. 2:23-CV-00490-JRG, 2:23-CV-00489-JRG, and 2:23-CV-00491-JRG are hereby **DECONSOLIDATED**. It is further **ORDERED** that Case Nos. 2:23-CV-00486-JRG-RSP, 2:23-CV-00487-JRG-RSP, 2:23-CV-00488-JRG-RSP, 2:23-CV-00490-JRG, 2:23-CV-00489-JRG,

and 2:23-CV-00491-JRG are hereby **CONSOLIDATED** for the purposes of pretrial. Further, it is **ORDERED** that Case No. 2:23-cv-486-JRG-RSP shall be the lead consolidated case, and that the other consolidated cases shall proceed according to the lead case's docket control order for all pretrial matters.

**So Ordered this**

**Feb 8, 2024**



---

RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE